

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0154	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Use of Buildings A and B for storage and distribution (Class B8) along with external alterations to include a single storey front extension to Building A to create a lobby area, recladding, new windows and loading bays, demolition of Building C and construction of a replacement single storey office building (Class E)		
Site:	Falcon Park, Hophurst Lane, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4XF, ,		
Validation Date	22 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	6 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	13 Apr 2026
Target Date:	23 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	14 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0154

**Falcon Park, Hophurst Lane, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4XF,
Use of Buildings A and B for storage and distribution (Class B8) along with external alterations to include a single storey front extension to Building A to create a lobby area, recladding, new windows and loading bays, demolition of Building C and construction of a replacement single storey office building (Class E)
Anthony Robinson**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Mid Sussex District Council Drainage: No objection.

Environmental Health Officer: Recommended condition to restrict hours of use.

West Sussex County Council Highways: *'The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.'*

Mid Sussex District Council Street Naming and Numbering: Informative recommended.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

'Worth Parish Council objects to this application on the grounds that the proposed B8 use class could enable future changes of use through permitted development rights, without the need for a full planning application. This raises concerns regarding the long term control and oversight of activities on the site.'

The application also refers to both vehicular and pedestrian access from Crawley Down. However, the Parish Council notes that there is no continuous pavement along this route, and therefore questions the suitability and safety of the road for frequent vehicular movements or pedestrian access.'

Should the Planning Officer be minded to approve the application, Worth Parish Council requests that the conditions imposed on the previous permissions (1997 and 2007) are reinstated to ensure appropriate control over the use and impact of the site.'

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the use of the existing buildings for storage and distribution (Class B8) as well as a single storey front extension, recladding, new windows and loading bays. The proposal would also demolish one of the existing buildings and construct a replacement single storey office (Class E) building in its place.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There have been a number of planning applications on site, however the below applications are considered to be the most relevant towards the determination of the current proposal:

WP/091/97 - Proposed demolition of existing rabbit buildings and portakabin; external alterations to main office building; use of existing storage building for storage of goods associated with the aviation business and reinstatement of unrestricted working hours. Permission 26.09.1997.

07/00504/FUL - Demolition of existing former rabbit timber shed and proposed erection of single storey internet goods storage unit, linked to existing two storey office building. Additional supporting information (Stage 1 Safety Audit) received 4th June 2006. Approved 06.08.2007.

08/02305/FUL - Installation of Sweet Chestnut Cladding to front elevation only of the existing office building (to match the cladding on the new internet store) and addition of new curved polycarbonate glazed projecting canopy to proposed internet store (approved under ref: WP/07/504/FUL). Permission 27.08.2008.

08/02384/FUL - Retention of the existing simulator in its current position and also retention of the existing associated Training Building together with revisions to the surfacing of the existing car park. Amendments to scheme as approved under 07/00504/FUL. Permission 27.08.2008.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Falcon Park which comprises a number of commercial and employment buildings along with some former ancillary structures nearby. The site is set to and accessed from the north-western side of Hophurst Lane. The primary warehouse building on site is set back from the highway edge by a front courtyard and parking space. There is mature tree planting to the sites periphery and the site borders open fields to its northern boundary. The existing warehouse building appears to be composed of timber clad walls, a corrugated metal roof and red framed windows.

The proposal breaks down the existing building into segments with the element furthest to the north-east described as building A, the segment in the middle as building B and the element furthest to the south-west described as building C.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within 7km buffer for the Ashdown Forest.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The development proposal would change the use of buildings A and B into storage and distribution (Class B8). Furthermore, the proposal would extend building A at ground floor level through an extension to create a lobby area. This extension would measure at approximately 5.4m in length, 7.5m wide and 3.1m high.

Building C to the south-west would be demolished as part of the development proposal and a new single storey office extension would be developed in its place. The proposal would adjoin building B and measure at approximately 19.9m in maximum length, 12.9m wide, 3.8m high to the eaves and 4.5m high to the ridge.

The buildings would also be reclad throughout with dark grey charred timber cladding, a zinc roof as well as dark framed windows and doors. New solar panels would also be installed to both the new single storey extension replacing building C's south-eastern facing roof slope and to building B's south-western roof slope. Rooflights would also be added to the single storey extensions north-western facing roof.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Specifically, Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,

- b) And local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
c) Any other material considerations.'

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP1: Sustainable Economic Development

DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP14: Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy

DP17: Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

DP21: Transport

DP26: Character and Design

DP28: Accessibility

DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution

DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction

DP41: Flood Risk and Drainage

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

Relevant policies.

Neighbourhood Plan

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (Made January 2016)

Policy CDNP06: Sustainable Drainage Systems

Policy CDNP07: Retention of Existing Employment Sites and Use of Vernacular Buildings

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 - 2039 - Submission Draft (Regulation 19

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage

DPH12 - Accessibility

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPN6 - Pollution

DPN7- Noise Impacts

DPN8 - Light Impacts and Dark Skies

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPC6 - Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 85, 115-117, 131, 135 & 139.

The NPPF sets out the government's policy in order to ensure that the planning system contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 sets out the three objectives to sustainable development, such that the planning system needs to perform an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states *'The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.'*

Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states *'Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'*

With specific reference to decision-taking paragraph 48 states that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Design Guide

Published in 2021, the National Design Guide illustrates how the government consider well-designed places that are beautiful, healthy, greener, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out that this national document, along with the National Model Design Code, should be used to guide decisions on application in the absence of locally design guides or design codes.

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Principle
- Impact on Character and Design
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Highways Impact
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Sustainability
- Other Matters
- Ashdown Forest
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Principle

The application site is designated as being within the countryside within the countryside. Policy DP12 of the District Plan refers to the protection of the countryside and states (in part):

'The countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty. Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and:

- it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture; or*
- it is supported by a specific policy reference either elsewhere in the Plan, a Development Plan Document or relevant Neighbourhood Plan.'*

Policy DP1 of the District Plan relates to sustainable economic development and seeks 'to promote a place which is attractive to a full range of businesses, and where local enterprise thrives, and to provide opportunities for people to live and work within their communities, reducing the need for commuting.' It also encourages 'high quality development of land and premises to meet the needs of 21st century businesses'.

Policy DP14 of the District Plan states that provided the proposed development does not conflict with DP12, new small scale economic development outside of built up area boundaries shall be permitted provided that:

- o it supports sustainable growth and the vitality of the rural economy; and
- o where possible, utilises previously developed sites.

Policy CDNP07 of the Neighbourhood Plan states among other matters that:

'New business development on land already in commercial use will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- d. the scale and nature of the proposals would not have significant harmful impact on the amenities of adjoining activities; and*
- e. the scale of the proposal is proportionate to the existing size of the building; and*
- f. the scale and nature of the proposals would not have unacceptable conflicts with agriculture and other land-use activities; and*
- g. the proposal would not have unacceptable impact on the local road network.'*

The proposed development would be sited within the existing envelope of the previously built-up site and would not constitute an isolated development within the countryside. Although the proposal would partly change the existing use on site, the proposal would utilise a previously developed site and location. Therefore, the principle of a new storage, distribution and office use on site in this location is considered to be acceptable. However, it is also necessary to consider other planning issues in order to determine the overall planning balance.

Impact on Character and Design

DP26 of the District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

o is of high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;
o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;
o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;
o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;
o does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution'

Policy CDNP07 of the Neighbourhood Plan states among other matters that the scale of the proposal should be proportionate to the existing size of the building.

The proposal would extend the existing building through the addition of a new single storey front extension which would utilise a flat roof design and would house a lobby area. It is considered that this feature would allow the front entrance to the building to be established and would not be of a significant footprint or scale. The extension would therefore be read as subservient towards the existing unit.

It is considered that the existing element referred to as building C is of limited architectural merit and in part utilises a sub-optimal flat roof design which interests with a pitched roof. It is therefore considered that this elements demolition would be acceptable. In terms of the proposed replacement, the proposal would be of a comparable size and would be contained to a single storey size and scale. The proposal would be of a slightly larger footprint than the existing and would feature a front projection to accommodate a doorway. It is considered that the proposed replacement would not appear overly incongruous within the sites context.

Throughout the unit, new cladding and exterior materials would be used, including dark grey charred timber cladding, a zinc roof as well as dark framed windows and doors. It is considered that these materials would give rise to a more contemporary appearance. Furthermore, some solar panels would be installed to some of the roof pitches throughout the unit. The building is considered to be set back from the roadside and is not considered to be set within a visually prominent position with regards to the street scene. Accordingly, it is considered that the use of these materials would be acceptable in this instance.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan and Policy CDNP07 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that development:

'does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see DP29);'

DP29 then relates to noise, air and light pollution:

The environment, including nationally designated environmental sites, nationally protected landscapes, areas of nature conservation or geological interest, wildlife habitats, and the quality of people's life will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, light and air pollution by only permitting development where:

Noise pollution:

- o It is designed, located and controlled to minimise the impact of noise on health and quality of life, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;*
- o If it is likely to generate significant levels of noise it incorporates appropriate noise attenuation measures;*

Noise sensitive development, such as residential, will not be permitted in close proximity to existing or proposed development generating high levels of noise unless adequate sound insulation measures, as supported by a noise assessment are incorporated within the development.

In appropriate circumstances, the applicant will be required to provide:

- o an assessment of the impact of noise generated by a proposed development; or*
- o an assessment of the effect of noise by an existing noise source upon a proposed development;*

Light pollution:

- o The impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation areas of artificial lighting proposals (including floodlighting) is minimised, in terms of intensity and number of fittings;*
- o The applicant can demonstrate good design including fittings to restrict emissions from proposed lighting schemes;*

Air Pollution:

- o It does not cause unacceptable levels of air pollution;*
 - o Development on land adjacent to an existing use which generates air pollution or odour would not cause any adverse effects on the proposed development or can be mitigated to reduce exposure to poor air quality to recognised and acceptable levels;*
 - o Development proposals (where appropriate) are consistent with Air Quality Management Plans.*
- The degree of the impact of noise and light pollution from new development or change of use is likely to be greater in rural locations, especially where it is in or close to specially designated areas and sites.*

Following further correspondence, the Applicant indicated that the proposed uses were to only operate during daytime hours. In response to this detail, no objection has been raised from the Environmental Health Officer however a condition restricting the hours of use has been recommended. Such a condition is considered to be relevant and necessary should planning permission be granted, in the interest of protecting neighbouring amenities.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

Highways Impact

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Additionally, Policy DP21 of the District Plan requires development proposals to protect the safety of road users and pedestrians.

The proposed development would not alter the existing sites access from Hophurst Road and it was commented in response to the application by the Highways Engineer that it was not expected that there would be a significant intensification in movements to and from the site.

In response to the proposal, the Highways Engineer also commented that the proposal would satisfy the proposed parking demand generated as a result of the proposed uses. Conditions requiring the proposed cycle store shown on the submitted plans and the general parking layout was suggested by the Highways Engineer which are considered to be necessary in the interest of highways safety.

In summary, it was not considered by the Highways Engineer that there would be any highways grounds to resist the proposal. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP21 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan notes that:

'Particular attention will be paid to those areas of the District that have experienced flooding in the past and proposals for development should seek to reduce the risk of flooding by achieving a reduction from existing run-off rates.'

Furthermore Policy CDNP06 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that:

'Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they include sustainable drainage systems designed to manage the risk of surface water flooding within their boundaries, and that they will not increase flood risk elsewhere in the Parish. Examples of sustainable drainage systems include permeable driveways and parking areas, water harvesting and storage features (rain/grey), green roofs and soakaways. The preferred hierarchy of managing surface water drainage from any development is:

- 1) infiltration measures;*
- 2) attenuation and discharge to watercourses;*
- 3) discharge to surface water only sewers.*

Such measures should protect the amenity and security of other properties and should not adversely affect the water table and associated aquifers or ancient woodland. Arrangements for the maintenance of drainage systems shall be required as a condition of planning permissions and these arrangements shall include details of who will manage and fund the maintenance for the lifetime of the development.'

A Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Drainage Strategy has been submitted in support of the application. Following review by the Council's Drainage Engineer, it was noted that no objection would be raised towards the development given its proposed scope and scale. A pre-commencement condition was however recommended, requiring the submission of foul and surface water means of disposal details. The Applicant has provided their agreement to this condition prior to the applications determination.

It is considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable flood risk and drainage impact. The proposal would therefore comply with DP41 of the District Plan and Policy CDNP06 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Sustainability

Policy DP39 of the District Plan relates to Sustainable Design and Construction and requires development proposals to improve the sustainability of development. It states:

'All development proposals must seek to improve the sustainability of development and should where appropriate and feasible according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures:

- Minimise energy use through the design and layout of the scheme including through the use of natural lighting and ventilation,

- Explore opportunities for efficient energy supply through the use of communal heating networks where viable and feasible,
- Use renewable sources of energy,
- Maximise efficient use of resources, including minimising waste and maximising recycling/re-use of materials through both construction and occupation,
- Limit water use to 110 litres/person/day in accordance with Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment,
- Demonstrate how the risks associated with future climate change have been planned for as part of the layout of the scheme and design of its buildings to ensure its longer term resilience'

There would be a number of measures to improve the sustainability credentials of the proposal. This would include the reuse and refurbishment of the existing elements at buildings A and B as opposed to wholesale redevelopment. The proposal would also include solar PV panels which would allow for the generation of renewable energy on site.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development will be compliant with Policy DP39 of the District Plan.

Other Matters

Concerns have been raised in response to the proposal regarding the proposed future use of the building. It was commented that the proposed B8 use class could benefit from permitted development rights in the future. However, Class B8 does not benefit from any immediate permitted development rights without prior approval.

Ashdown Forest

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations'), the competent authority - in this case, Mid Sussex District Council - has a duty to ensure that any plans or projects that they regulate (including plan making and determining planning applications) will have no adverse effect on the integrity of a European site of nature conservation importance. The European site of focus is the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The potential effects of development on Ashdown Forest were assessed during the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031. This process identified likely significant effects on the Ashdown Forest SPA from recreational disturbance and on the Ashdown Forest SAC from atmospheric pollution.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken for the proposed development in this planning application.

Recreational disturbance

Increased recreational activity arising from new residential development and related population growth is likely to disturb the protected near-ground and ground nesting birds on Ashdown Forest.

In accordance with advice from Natural England, the HRA for the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, and as detailed in District Plan Policy DP17, mitigation measures are necessary to counteract the effects of a potential increase in recreational pressure and are required for developments resulting in a net increase in dwellings within a 7km zone of influence around the Ashdown Forest SPA. A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation approach has been developed. This mitigation approach has been agreed with Natural England.

This planning application does not result in a net increase in dwellings within the 7km zone of influence and so mitigation is not required.

Atmospheric pollution

Increased traffic emissions as a consequence of new development may result in additional atmospheric pollution on Ashdown Forest. The main pollutant effects of interest are acid deposition and eutrophication by nitrogen deposition. High levels of nitrogen may detrimentally affect the composition of an ecosystem and lead to loss of species.

The potential effects of the proposed development are incorporated into the overall results of the transport model prepared for the Mid Sussex Transport Study, which indicates there would not be an overall impact on Ashdown Forest. This means that there is not considered to be a significant in combination effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC by this development proposal.

Conclusion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment

The Habitats Regulations Assessment concludes that there would be no likely significant effects, alone or in combination, on the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC from the proposed development.

No mitigation is required in relation to the Ashdown Forest SPA or SAC.

A full HRA (that is, the appropriate assessment stage that ascertains the effect on integrity of the European site) of the proposed development is not required.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain this application is comprises development below the de-minimis threshold meaning that this development is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan.

Courts have confirmed that the Development Plan must be considered as a whole, not simply in relation to any one individual policy. It is therefore not the case that a proposal must accord with each and every policy within the Development Plan.

The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of exterior design within the surrounding context and the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore accords with Policies DP1, DP12, DP14, DP17, DP21, DP26, DP28, DP29, DP39 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies CDNP06 and CDNP07 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas